



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ingly, after notice of termination by G's executor, the only relief would be on the above equitable grounds.

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANIES — SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE — CONDITIONS TO GRANTING RELIEF.** — The plaintiff contracted to furnish the defendant city with water and light, together with a certain number of hydrants and arc lamps for the use of which the city was to pay a specified rental. Owing to the direction in which the city had grown, certain of the hydrants and lights were useless, and others were not advantageously located. The city refused to go on with the contract. *Held*, specific performance will be granted subject to the equitable modifications of the contract that certain hydrants and lights be relocated. *La Follette v. La Follette Water, Light, & Tel. Co.*, 252 Fed. 762 (C. C. A., 6th Circuit, Tenn.).

If unforeseen contingencies produce hardship in the performance of a contract, specific performance may be granted with such modifications as justice requires. *King v. Raab*, 123 Ia. 632, 99 N. W. 306; *Wright v. Vocalion Organ Co.*, 148 Fed. 209. But mere hardship resulting from foreseeable circumstances will not prevent complete relief to the plaintiff. *Franklin Tel. Co. v. Harrison*, 145 U. S. 459; *Clark v. Hutzler*, 96 Va. 73, 30 S. E. 469. On this ground the principal case is wrong. The result, however, is correct on the principle that a public utility must furnish reasonable service. A utility may not contract that it be relieved of its public duty. *Inter-Ocean Pub. Co. v. Associated Press*, 184 Ill. 438, 56 N. E. 822; *Smith v. Gold & Stock Tel. Co.*, 42 Hun (N. Y.) 454. Then, as in the instant case, if the performance of a contract conflicts with the legal duty of the utility to render reasonable service, the contract is unlawful. See 32 HARV. L. REV. 74, 79. This principle is also illustrated by the regulation of fares according to the necessities of adequate service, despite prior stipulations fixing the rate. *Rogers Park Water Co. v. Fergus*, 180 U. S. 624; *Arlington Board of Survey v. Bay State St. Ry.*, 224 Mass. 463, 113 N. E. 273. Some courts, however, have put the regulation of rates under the police power. See 32 HARV. L. REV. 74, and cases cited. It would seem to follow that a special contract would have no effect whatever. But it is not futile. The consumer under the contract should be bound to accept the service of the utility, whereas if there were no contract, he could refuse. The only limitation on this service is that it be reasonable at all times.

**RES JUDICATA — WHAT JUDGMENTS ARE CONCLUSIVE — AWARD OF JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.** — A statute provided that every person who shall carelessly damage any lamp-post belonging to the Electric Light Company shall pay by way of satisfaction to the company an amount not exceeding £5, as any two justices or the sheriff shall think reasonable. The plaintiff, in his suit before the justices, was awarded £5, and now seeks to recover for the additional damage; the extent of the damage being £29. *Held*, that the award by the justices made the matter *res judicata*. *Birmingham Corporation v. Samuel Allsopp and Sons, Ltd.*, 145 L. T. 454.

The statute involved in the principal case did not preclude the plaintiff from bringing suit before a tribunal competent to award full compensation. *Crystal Palace Gas Co. v. Idris & Co.*, 82 L. T. R. 200. The case then comes within the rule that a judgment by a justice of the peace is a bar to another proceeding on the same cause of action. *Worrall v. Des Moines Retail Grocers' Ass.*, 157 Iowa, 385, 138 N. W. 481; *Liscum v. Henderson Sturgis Piano Co.*, 44 Okla. 549, 145 Pac. 773. See *Brundsen v. Humphrey*, 14 Q. B. D. 141, 145. Even if the plaintiff objects that the award is inadequate, the rule is still applicable. *Wright v. London General Omnibus Co.*, 2 Q. B. D. 271. *Cf. Bilyeu v. Pilcher*, 16 Okla. 228, 83 Pac. 546; *Pilcher v. Ligon*, 91